

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

George Holmes, # 289114,	)	C/A No. 9:11-735-SB-BHH
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	Report and Recommendation
vs.	)	
	)	
Inv. J. Fraser, BCSO,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
	)	

Plaintiff, proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* under 28 U.S.C. § 1915, brings this case pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff complains that he was convicted pursuant to evidence obtained without a search warrant. He asks that this Court ensure that the application for Post-Conviction Relief (PCR) he has filed in state court be granted.

*Pro Se and In Forma Pauperis Review*

Under established local procedure in this judicial district, a careful review has been made of the *pro se* complaint herein pursuant to the procedural provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1915. This review has been conducted in light of the following precedents: *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 324-25 (1989); *Estelle v. Gamble*, 429 U.S. 97 (1976); *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519 (1972); and *Gordon v. Leeke*, 574 F.2d 1147 (4<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1978).

The complaint *sub judice* has been filed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915, which permits an indigent litigant to commence an action in federal court without paying the administrative costs of proceeding with the lawsuit. To protect against possible abuses of this privilege, the statute allows a district court to dismiss the case upon a finding that the action “fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted” or is “frivolous or malicious.” § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i), (ii). A finding of frivolity can be made where the complaint “lacks an

arguable basis either in law or in fact.” *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25, 31 (1992). Hence, under § 1915(e)(2)(B), a claim based on a meritless legal theory may be dismissed *sua sponte*. *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319 (1989); *Allison v. Kyle*, 66 F.3d 71 (5<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1995).

The court may dismiss a claim as “factually frivolous” under § 1915(e) if the facts alleged are clearly baseless. *Denton*, 504 U.S. at 31. In making this determination, the court is not bound to accept without question the truth of the plaintiff’s allegations, but rather need only weigh the plaintiff’s factual allegations in his favor. *Id.*

This Court is required to liberally construe *pro se* documents, *Estelle v. Gamble*, 429 U.S. 97 (1976), holding them to a less stringent standard than those drafted by attorneys, *Hughes v. Rowe*, 449 U.S. 9 (1980) (*per curiam*). Even under this less stringent standard, however, the *pro se* complaint is subject to summary dismissal. The mandated liberal construction afforded to *pro se* pleadings means that if the court can reasonably read the pleadings to state a valid claim on which the plaintiff could prevail, it should do so, but a district court may not rewrite a petition to include claims that were never presented, *Barnett v. Hargett*, 174 F.3d 1128, 1133 (10<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1999), or construct the plaintiff’s legal arguments for him, *Small v. Endicott*, 998 F.2d 411, 417-18 (7<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1993), or “conjure up questions never squarely presented” to the court, *Beaudett v. City of Hampton*, 775 F.2d 1274, 1278 (4<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1985).

#### Background and Discussion

Plaintiff complains that Defendant violated his rights by charging him with a crime before he was arrested, and by searching his property without a search warrant. Plaintiff was convicted of unlawful possession of a weapon. However, he is not requesting damages

for these alleged violations. Rather, the relief he seeks appears to sound in habeas, or in the form of some direction given by this Court to state court, presumably via a writ of mandamus. In the “Relief” section of the complaint Plaintiff writes:

I'd like the court to dismiss these charges. I'm in the process of A Post-Conviction Relief (PCR) I'm just asking for A fair Court process, because the Public Defender I had was found ineffective assistance of counsel I was sent to DMH, DDSN and Just Care for incompetent to stand trial. When I go up for my PCR relief I want these charges get dismiss or time served.

ECF No. 1 at 5 (all punctuation and grammar in original).

To the extent that the complaint sounds in habeas, relief is unavailable at this time. Plaintiff makes clear that he has not exhausted his state-court remedies, but is, in fact, currently pursuing a PCR. Federal habeas law requires exhaustion of state remedies:

(b)(1) An application for a writ of habeas corpus on behalf of a person in custody pursuant to the judgment of a State court shall not be granted unless it appears that--

(A) the applicant has exhausted the remedies available in the courts of the State; or

(B)(i) there is an absence of available State corrective process; or

(ii) circumstances exist that render such process ineffective to protect the rights of the applicant.

28 U.S.C. § 2254.

Additionally, absent extraordinary circumstances, federal district courts are not authorized to interfere with a state's pending proceedings. See, e.g., *Younger v. Harris*, 401 U.S. 37, 44 (1971); and *Cinema Blue of Charlotte, Inc. v. Gilchrist*, 887 F.2d 49, 50-53 (4th Cir. 1989). In *Cinema Blue*, the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit ruled that federal district courts should abstain from constitutional challenges to state judicial proceedings, no matter how meritorious, if the federal claims have been or could be presented in an ongoing state judicial proceeding. *Cinema Blue* at 52. See also *Bonner*

*v. Circuit Court of St. Louis*, 526 F.2d 1331 (8th Cir. 1975)(*en banc*). In *Bonner v. Circuit Court of St. Louis*, the United States Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit pointed out that federal constitutional claims are cognizable in both state courts and in federal courts: "Congress and the federal courts have consistently recognized that federal courts should permit state courts to try state cases, and that, where constitutional issues arise, state court judges are fully competent to handle them subject to Supreme Court review." *Bonner* at 1336.

To the extent that the complaint asks this Court to direct a particular finding in a state court case, the complaint can be interpreted as a petition for a writ of mandamus. See *Black's Law Dictionary* (8<sup>th</sup> ed. 2004) ("mandamus" is [a] "writ issued by a superior court to compel a lower court or a government officer to perform mandatory or purely ministerial duties correctly"); see also 28 U.S.C. § 1651.

Circuit precedents teach that a writ of mandamus is a drastic remedy. The writ of mandamus is infrequently used by federal courts, and its use is usually limited to cases where a federal court is acting in aid of *its own* jurisdiction. See 28 U.S.C. § 1361; *Gurley v. Superior Ct. of Mecklenburg County*, 411 F.2d 586, 587-88 & nn. 2-4 (4th Cir. 1969). A federal district court may issue a writ of mandamus only against an employee or official of the United States. See *Moye v. Clerk, DeKalb County Sup. Court*, 474 F.2d 1275, 1275-76 (5th Cir.1973) (federal courts do not have original jurisdiction over mandamus actions to compel an officer or employee of a state to perform a duty owed to the petitioner). Therefore, even if the state court in question was a respondent in this case (which it is not), it would not be possible for this Court to issue a writ of mandamus directing that Plaintiff's PCR be resolved in his favor.

Recommendation

The District Court should dismiss the complaint in the above-captioned case *without prejudice* and without issuance and service of process for failure to state a claim on which relief may be granted. See *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 324-25 (1989); *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519 (1972). **Plaintiff's attention is directed to the important notice on the next page.**

s/Bruce Howe Hendricks  
United States Magistrate Judge

April 25, 2011  
Charleston, South Carolina

### **Notice of Right to File Objections to Report and Recommendation**

The parties are advised that they may file specific written objections to this Report and Recommendation with the District Judge. Objections must specifically identify the portions of the Report and Recommendation to which objections are made and the basis for such objections. “[I]n the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310 (4<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note).

Specific written objections must be filed within fourteen (14) days of the date of service of this Report and Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b); see Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(a), (d). Filing by mail pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 5 may be accomplished by mailing objections to:

Larry W. Propes, Clerk  
United States District Court  
Post Office Box 835  
Charleston, South Carolina 29402

**Failure to timely file specific written objections to this Report and Recommendation will result in waiver of the right to appeal from a judgment of the District Court based upon such Recommendation.** 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841 (4th Cir. 1985); *United States v. Schronce*, 727 F.2d 91 (4th Cir. 1984).